



REMARKS

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for withdrawing previous rejection of Claims 1-19 under 35 USC 103(a), for withdrawing the finality of the Office Action of January 21, 2005 and for entering Applicant's submission filed on April 21, 2005.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present case. Claims 1, 7, 11 and 15 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above amendments to the present application and the arguments set forth below. No new matter is added herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over US Patent No. 5,893,916A to Dooley (hereinafter Dooley) in view of Red Hat Linux by Husain, et al. (hereinafter Husain) and US Patent No. 6,721,713B1 to Guheen, et al. (hereinafter Guheen). Applicant has reviewed the references cited and respectfully asserts that Claims 1-19 are patentable over the cited references for the following rationale.

As Applicant understands the reference, Dooley teaches a method of converting text-based UNIX™ man pages to formatted help topic files of the type including non-textual formatting codes. Dooley, Col. 1, l. 55-60. As Applicant understands the term, a man page is a manual page of documentation relating to the UNIX™ system in an online manual. Freedman, A., Computer Desktop Encyclopedia 9th, Osborne/McGraw-Hill, 2001, 583. Files relating to help topics provide instruction regarding program use. Id. at 420. As Applicant understands the provided reference, Husain teaches briefly on using Linux manual pages (also referred to as man pages), such as finding keywords therein. Guheen teaches the

conveyance of information regarding a web architecture framework and specifically, to identifying alliances of various business enterprises in a network based system framework. Guheen at col. 1, ll. 6-8; col. 1, l. 65-col.2, l. 30.

The teachings of Dooley, Husain and Guheen, separately or in any combination, differ from the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1-19. As amended herein, Claim 1 reads as follows, with underlining added for emphasis:

1. In a computer operating system using commands with command specifications in command definition files, a method for generating command documentation content, said method comprising:

a) examining a command definition file for a syntactic structure of a corresponding command, wherein said command definition file comprises a linkpoint, a keyword, and an argument;

b) extracting a documentation requirement from said syntactic structure wherein said syntactic structure closely represents actual documentation content relating to said command and wherein English-like syntax corresponding to said documentation content models actual content associated with said command definition file;

c) extracting documentation options from said syntactic structure wherein said documentation requirement and said documentation options correspond to a partial fraction of said actual content associated with said command definition file; and

d) combining said documentation requirement and said documentation options into a documentation tag construct; and

e) automatically generating a standard template for a documentation content file, wherein said document content file comprises a natural language explanation of said keyword and said argument, wherein said document content file provides a standard framework with automatically generated content and wherein said automatically generated content is end-user over-writable with one or more of documentation content and data of relevance and localized to said end-user.

Claims 7, 11, and 15 are amended herein in a fashion similar to Claim 1, shown above. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-19 respectively depend on independent Claims 1, 7, 11, and 15 and incorporate each of their elements.

As amended herein, Claims 1, 7, 11 and 15 recite a method for generating command documentation content that includes examining a command definition file for a syntactic structure of a corresponding command. A documentation requirement is extracted from that syntactic structure. The syntactic structure closely represents actual documentation content relating to the command. English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content models actual content associated with the command definition file. Documentation options are extracted from the syntactic structure. The documentation requirement and the documentation options correspond to a partial fraction of the actual content associated with the command definition file.

Examining a command definition file, comprising a linkpoint, keyword and argument, for syntactic structure from which syntactic structure closely resending actual documentation content relating to the command is beneficial because documentation so produced conforms with structural standards. The use of English-like syntax for documenting content advantageously provides a clear model of actual command definition file content and helps provide a standard framework that can be replaced, as desired, with more precise documentation content and data that may be applicable for generating documentation. Further, rendering documentation requirements and options as partial fractions of actual command definition file content advantageously promotes stability as well as linguistic localization.

Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in Dooley directed towards generating command documentation content with examining a command definition file for a syntactic structure that is closely representative of actual documentation content relating to a corresponding command, and which allows extraction of documentation requirement from such a closely representative syntactic structure, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. On the contrary, Dooley expressly teaches "converting text-based [UNIX™] man pages to formatted help topic files of the type including non-textual formatting codes." Dooley at col. 1, ll. 55-60. Dooley goes on to explain that this is an automated process for facilitating the porting of applications. Id.

Applicant also finds no teaching or suggestion in Dooley directed towards documentation requirements and documentation options corresponding to a partial fraction of the actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. On the contrary, Dooley implicitly teaches that whole man pages are so converted. Id. Further to the contrary, Dooley expressly teaches that man pages, in their typical format, include "only basic formatting information," that "there are widely varying formats of man pages that are based upon this basic file structure," and that "[i]n the preferred embodiment, the man pages [i.e., each entire man page of the plurality thereof] are used with" a particular software product. Id. at col. 2 l. 62-col. 3, l. 7.

Further, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in Dooley directed towards English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. On the contrary and as discussed above, Dooley expressly teaches that text-based UNIX™ man pages are converted "to formatted help topic files of the

type including non-textual formatting codes." Dooley at col. 1, ll. 55-60. Again, Dooley goes on to explain that this is an automated process for facilitating the porting of applications. Id.

Likewise, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in Husain directed towards generating command documentation content with examining a command definition file for a syntactic structure that is closely representative of actual documentation content relating to a corresponding command, and which allows extraction of documentation requirement from such a closely representative syntactic structure, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. Applicant also finds no teaching or suggestion in Husain directed towards documentation requirements and documentation options corresponding to a partial fraction of the actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein.

Further, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in Husain directed towards English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. On the contrary, Husain expressly and clearly states the following: "Be warned, however, that man pages are often written in a very formal and stylized way that sometimes bears little resemblance to English." Husain at 90, underlining added for emphasis.

With reference to Guheen, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion therein, which is directed towards generating command documentation content with examining a command definition file for a syntactic structure that is closely representative of actual documentation content relating to a corresponding command,

and which allows extraction of documentation requirement from such a closely representative syntactic structure, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. Applicant also finds no teaching or suggestion in Guheen that is directed towards documentation requirements and documentation options corresponding to a partial fraction of the actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. Further, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in Guheen that is directed towards English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein.

Moreover, independent Claims 1, 7, 11 and 15 recite:

e) automatically generating a standard template for a documentation content file, wherein said document content file comprises a natural language explanation of said keyword and said argument, wherein said document content file provides a standard framework with automatically generated content and wherein said automatically generated content is end-user over-writable with one or more of documentation content and data of relevance and localized to said end-user.

Generating a standard template for a documentation content file that comprises a natural language explanation of command elements, provides a standard framework with automatically generated content that is end user over-writable with documentation content, and data of relevance and localized to the end user allows the benefit of supporting, not only higher level documentation, but linguistic localization, i.e., localization to human languages other than English.

Applicant finds no such teaching or suggestion in Guheen that is directed towards generating a standard template for a documentation content file that comprises a natural language explanation of command elements, provides a standard framework with automatically generated content that is end user over-

writable with documentation content, and data of relevance and localized to the end user, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. On the contrary, those localization and translation capabilities that Guheen does teach are clearly and expressly delimited therein to "translat[ing] text embedded in images, JAVA, JAVASCRIPT, source code and parameters, CGI scripts, database files, email, and ADOBE PDF files to and from each other" (Guheen at col. 219, ll. 32-52 (quotation from ll. 49-52 therein), i.e., expressly not a natural language explanation of command elements, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein, and expressly not English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein.

Applicant respectfully points out that, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the references cited to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found in either the references themselves or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. MPEP § 2143.01; In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Here, as discussed above, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in any of the cited Dooley, Husain and Guheen references directed towards generating command documentation content with examining a command definition file for a syntactic structure that is closely representative of actual documentation content relating to a corresponding command, and which allows extraction of documentation requirement from such a closely representative syntactic structure, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. Applicant also finds no teaching or suggestion in any of the cited Dooley, Husain and Guheen references directed towards documentation requirements and documentation options

corresponding to a partial fraction of the actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. Further, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in any of the cited Dooley, Husain and Guheen references directed towards English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. For at least these reasons therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claims 1, 7, 11 and 15 and their respective dependent claims are allowable over the cited references under 35 USC § 103(a).

Moreover, the claimed embodiments recited herein relate to (1) syntactic structure closely representing actual documentation content relating to the command, (2) English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, and (3) documentation requirement and the documentation options extracted from the syntactic structure correspond to a partial fraction of the actual content associated with the command definition file. In contrast however as discussed above, each of the cited references teaches, at least in part to the contrary.

In contrast to syntactic structure closely representing actual documentation content relating to the command as claimed herein, Dooley expressly teaches conversion of "text-based man pages to formatted help topic files of the type including non-textual formatting codes." Dooley at col. 1, ll. 55-60, In contrast to documentation requirement and the documentation options extracted from the syntactic structure correspond to a partial fraction of the actual content associated with the command definition file as claimed herein, Dooley implicitly teaches that whole man pages are so converted. Id. In contrast to English-like syntax corresponding to

documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file as claimed herein, Dooley expressly teaches that man pages, in their typical format, include "only basic formatting information." Id. at col. 2, l. 62-col. 3, l. 7. Further, in contrast to English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file as claimed herein, Dooley expressly teaches that text-based UNIX™ man pages are converted "to formatted help topic files of the type including non-textual formatting codes." Id. at col. 1, ll. 55-60. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Dooley reference teaches away from the claimed embodiments recited herein.

In contrast to English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, as claimed herein, Husain expressly and clearly states "that man pages are often written in a very formal and stylized way that sometimes bears little resemblance to English." Husain at 90, underlining added for emphasis. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Husain reference teaches away from the claimed embodiments recited herein.

The claimed embodiments recited herein relate to automatically generating a standard template for a documentation content file that comprises a natural language explanation of command elements, provides a standard framework with automatically generated content that is end user over-writable with documentation content, and data of relevance and localized to the end user allows the benefit of supporting, not only higher level documentation, but linguistic localization, i.e., localization to human languages other than English.

However, Guheen teaches in clear contrast to (1) English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, and (2) automatically generating a standard template for a documentation content file that comprises a natural language explanation of command elements, provides a standard framework with automatically generated content that is end user over-writable with documentation content, and data of relevance and localized to the end user allows the benefit of supporting, not only higher level documentation, but linguistic localization, i.e., localization to human languages other than English, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein.

As discussed above, those localization and translation capabilities that Guheen does teach are clearly and expressly delimited therein to "translat[ing] text embedded in images, JAVA, JAVASCRIPT, source code and parameters, CGI scripts, database files, email, and ADOBE PDF files to and from each other" (Guheen at col. 219, ll. 32-52; quotation from ll. 49-52 therein), i.e., expressly not a natural language explanation of command elements, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein, and expressly not English-like syntax corresponding to documentation content modeling actual content associated with the command definition file, as recited in the claimed embodiments herein. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Guheen reference teaches away from the claimed embodiments recited herein.

In as much as the Dooley, Husain and Guheen references all so teach away from the claimed embodiments recited herein, Applicant finds no teaching, suggestion or motivation, expressed or implied in any of the references for a combination of their teachings to achieve these claimed embodiments herein.

Further, Applicant finds nothing in Dooley that cures any of the defects of Husain and/or Guheen, separately of combined, which are discussed above. Applicant also finds nothing in Husain that cures any of the defects of Guheen and/or Dooley, separately of combined, which are discussed above. Similarly, Applicant finds nothing in Guheen that cures any of the defects of either Dooley and/or Husain, separately of combined, which are discussed above.

For the foregoing rationale therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1, 7, 11 and 15 and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Dooley in view of Husain and Guheen under 35 USC § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

By the rationale stated above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-19 are allowable under 35 USC § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 1-19 be withdrawn and that Claims 1-19 be allowed.

Please charge our deposit account No. 23-0085, for any unpaid fees.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP



Lawrence R. Goerke
Reg. No. 45,927

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Tel.: (408) 938-9060
Fax: (408) 938-9069

Dated: Aug. 18, 2005